

REMARKS

Claims 1-13 and 15-20 are currently pending in this application. It is gratefully acknowledged that the Examiner has allowed Claims 11-13 and 15-20. The Examiner has objected to Claims 4 and 6-10 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 2 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello et al. (U.S. Patent 6,754,894) in view of Brown, III et al. (U.S. Patent 6,038,636). The Examiner rejected Claims 3 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costello et al. in view of Brown, III et al. and Niiyama et al. (U.S. Patent 5,400,389).

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 1, the Examiner states that Costello et al. in view of Brown, III et al. renders the claim obvious. Costello et al. discloses wireless software and configuration parameter modification for mobile electronic devices; and, Brown, III et al. discloses a method and apparatus for reclaiming and defragmenting a flash memory device.

Claim 1 recites a flash memory, a first memory and a second memory, the first and second memories being independent memories.

According to Brown, III et al., a system includes a flash memory device, which is divided into a plurality of individually erasable memory portions, a designated memory area and a memory reclamation mechanism. The Examiner states that Brown, III et al. discloses that data is copied from a flash memory to another memory based on whether the data is valid.

However, Brown, III et al. just teaches that all the valid data is copied from one part of the flash memory to another part of the flash memory. But Brown, III et al. fails to disclose copying data from the flash memory to a RAM. That is, Brown, III et al. merely discloses storing all the data in the flash memory. Costello et al. does not cure the deficiencies of Brown, III et al.

Based on at least the foregoing, withdrawal of the rejections of Claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Independent Claim 1 is believed to be in condition for allowance. Without conceding the patentability per se of dependent Claims 2, 3 and 5-10, these are likewise believed to be allowable by virtue of their dependence on their respective amended independent claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of dependent Claims 2, 3 and 5-10 is respectfully requested.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the Application, namely, Claims 1-13 and 15-20, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Ferrell

Reg. No. 33,494

Attorney for Applicant

DILWORTH & BARRESE
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.
Uniondale, New York 11553
Tel: (516) 228-8484
Fax: (516) 228-8516

PJF/MJM/dr